

Paus -
India -

APR 1 1 1930
993

INDIA

discussed by

SAILENDRANATH GHOSE

and

EDWARD THOMPSON



125th New York Luncheon Discussion

February 15, 1930

FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION

INCORPORATED

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

EIGHTEEN EAST FORTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK

Pamphlet No. 65
Series 1929-30
April, 1930



Speakers

SAILENDRANATH GHOSE

Formerly Professor of Physics, University College, Calcutta; President, American Branch, Indian National Congress

EDWARD THOMPSON

Lecturer in Bengali at Oxford; Author, "An Indian Day," "History of India" and "The Other Side of the Medal"

Chairman

JAMES G. McDONALD

Speakers' Table

Harindranath Chattopadhyaya	Bishop Robert Lewis Paddock
R. J. Cruikshank	Miss Frances J. Pratt
Prof. John Dewey	Hemendra K. Rakshit
J. George Frederick	S. K. Ratcliffe
Prof. John L. Gerig	T. H. K. Rezmic
Hari G. Govil	Raymond T. Rich
Mrs. Josef Washington Hall	Dr. Joseph C. Robbins
Daniel Jivanayakam	Miss Premala Shahane
Sirdar Muhammed Yunus Khan	Howard Willets
Dr. John Howland Lathrop	Savel Zimand

INDIA

MR. JAMES G. McDONALD, Chairman

BEFORE we begin today's discussion, I should like to say to those of you who do not have the privilege of being members of the Foreign Policy Association that this Association is not merely a brilliant luncheon club. (Laughter) It is much more than a series of meetings like this, held throughout a large part of the country. The research work of the Association, designed primarily for the editors of the daily press of the country, is also intended for the average intelligent reader. That service of the F. P. A. is an effort on behalf of our group of experts to act as a general staff in factual matters dealing with foreign affairs. In that way we think we are playing a worthwhile role in the general education of the American people in foreign affairs and more particularly in those foreign affairs which directly concern us. Today's meeting is in a sense an exception to that, because primarily India is not our problem.

Those of you who are not members of the Association may become members at the close of this meeting if you can convince the young ladies outside the door that you are, as I have frequently put it, intelligent and interested in foreign affairs and the possessors of five dollars. (Laughter) And if you possess more and wish to make an additional contribution to this educational cause, you will be welcomed no less.

The budget of the Foreign Policy Association this year is \$168,000, about \$50,000 of which is made up of \$5 and \$10 memberships throughout the country, and the balance from a smaller group of men and women who believe that "facts are," as Mr. Owen D. Young put it, "our scarcest raw material," and yet the raw material most essential for the formation of a sound public opinion on foreign affairs.

We feel that we are doing something to make these facts available not merely to the man in the street but to those men and women, editors and others, whose chief business it is to shape opinion on foreign affairs.

The subject of today's meeting is "India." During the past eight or nine years of the Foreign Policy Association, we have at various times discussed this subject. At no time has the situation in India been more critical, more vital than it is today; and so we feel that it is a real oppor-

tunity to be able to present to this audience and to the much larger radio audience two speakers who, from different points of view and on the basis of intimate first-hand knowledge, can analyze for us the problems that underlie the situation in India today.

The first speaker is an Indian. Each of the speakers is to have not more than thirty minutes, no matter how brilliant or eloquent he may be.

The first speaker, Mr. Sailendranath Ghose, is the President of the American branch of the Indian National Congress, graduated from Calcutta University with the highest honors, and later Professor of Physics there. It is a great pleasure for me to introduce to this audience and to the radio audience Mr. Ghose. (Applause)

MR. SAILENDRANATH GHOSE

*M*R. McDONALD, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: For two thousand years India was the spiritual leader of Asia, which means half the human race. For two thousand years India was the intellectual leader of the world. India gave to the world two of its six greatest historic religions. India gave to the world two of the six greatest epic poems in all literature. Of the six greatest characters of all time, India produced two, Buddha and Asoka the Great.

India contributed to the world the decimal system or Arabic notation, which is the foundation of modern mathematics and other sciences. India created the beginning of most of the sciences of the world. Her art, her literature, and her architecture have withstood the ravages of time and competition.

India once was the richest nation of the earth. The "wealth of the Indies" was a proverbial expression of prosperity. In fact, Columbus set sail to discover a new route to India to obtain abundant commerce with my country for the enrichment of Europe when he accidentally discovered America. You are our by-product and we are not ashamed of you. (Laughter) You were once an Indian detour. (Laughter) Today you are the inspiring highway of world democracy.

Up until two centuries ago India was a national entity with an independent government of its own, its own standard of living and of material wealth and of intellectual achievement. Today India is the poorest nation on the earth, the pesthouse of the world so far as ignorance, disease and poverty are concerned.

What has happened during the last two centuries to bring this condition about? The thing that has happened, ladies and gentlemen, is this: England has put her hand on India and that touch has been deadly.

England has built up her British Empire on the slave trade of Africa, on the piracy of the high seas, and on the plunder of India. For two centuries she has perpetuated an economic penetration in India which has reduced India virtually to slavery. Living as she has been for two centuries under slave economic conditions, she intensified and perpetuated slave social and slave religious antagonisms.

The social life of India today is a mere stagnant pool, and every year shows a lessening of the average life of our people, a greater death rate, and a greater misery of the masses. Slavery produces slaves. Slavery nourishes superstition, bigotry and prejudice.

Standing here as an Indian, I would be ashamed to make a confession of my country's economic and social degradation if the blame for it could be placed upon my own people. And I indignantly share the sentiment expressed by the great American poet of the last century who so solemnly declared when Ireland's illiteracy was being condemned, "It is not the shame of Ireland, it is the shame of her conqueror and of her oppressor."

I stand before you to declare that India is determined to be done with it. India has declared she must be free. India has definitely decided to throw off the alien yoke, and foreign oppression. She will take her place in the family of free nations of the world. We shall obtain our liberty through peaceful means if possible; for the cause of common good and of peace we shall strive to achieve our liberty through non-violent means.

We have from today, the 15th of this month, installed a program of peaceful civil disobedience, under the command of the world's greatest and most patient pacifist, Mahatma Gandhi. (Applause) But the fervor of the people of India for liberty cannot be abated. It can however be aggravated. If the desire for liberty of my people be met with ugly, unyielding military resistance, let me tell you we are prepared to use the means employed by the American people in 1775.

This decision by the people of India is most momentous to the cause of world peace. India has a population of over 320,000,000. She has an area substantially as large as that of the United States. Her great natural wealth can crown India one of the greatest industrial and agricultural countries of the world. India can become the greatest patron of American exports. More important however, India is the greatest potent force of democracy in Eastern civilization. And today India is fired with the

same enthusiasm for liberty which dominated the spirit of your own patriots during your Revolution.

India's demand for liberty is based upon the principle enunciated by Abraham Lincoln that "no nation is good enough to rule another." It accepts the American doctrine that any people has "the revolutionary right to overthrow any government which exists not for its interests or with its consent."

India stands on all fours with the solemn pronouncement of the American Declaration of Independence that the ties which bind one people to an alien empire must be severed and in its place should be established a government which shall derive its power from the consent of the governed.

I wish to make it clear right here that in spite of all our internal differences, in spite of all our sectional antagonisms, in spite of all the social vices that may prevail in India today, in spite of all the other handicaps which exist, in spite of our Hindu-Moslem differences, India is fundamentally united in its determination to be free and independent. (Applause)

India's woes propagated by the British have returned like a boomerang to strike down Britain's disgusting rule. The British have ruled India not in the interests of the Indian people but for the enrichment of themselves. They have fostered, they have furthered internal differences and sectional antagonisms because it served their purpose to keep my people divided. They have fostered social stagnation. They have encouraged Indian mothers to drug their babies with opium and opium derivatives, over which they maintain a sole monopoly, to make my people docile, submissive and bereft of manly virtues.

India once the richest is now the poorest nation on earth. Once the intellectual leader of the world it now grovels in illiteracy. These degrading changes have come about under British rule in India.

No longer shall my people suffer these shameful abuses. We shall take our place in the sun. Blood will be shed. Already they are sending their mercenary soldiers to my people to cow them down as they sent hired Hessians and drunken savages to subdue the American colonies in 1776.

England has a tremendous financial stake in India. She will shoot down my people again as she massacred them so shamelessly at Amritsar and during the Sepoy mutiny. But they cannot shoot the desire for liberty out of the hearts of my people. It has come to stay. It will triumph.

The extent of Britain's financial stake in India may give you an indication of the extent to which she will go to maintain her grip on India

if she can. The Indian National Congress which voted for complete independence only about six weeks ago also voted to repudiate India's national debt of \$3,600,000,000, which is financed entirely by Britain. We shall retrieve \$7,000,000,000 of British capital invested in India, in Indian railways, mines, concessions, plantations and other economic projects.

When the British invested their capital in India for their own enrichment they risked the chance that some day India would be free and along with their freedom would obtain the revolutionary right to determine the fate of foreign investments within their borders.

May I remind you, friends, you did the same after your Revolutionary War?

British shipping interests which control India's coastal trade and which control a business which exceeded \$200,000,000 last year will be replaced by India's own shipping interests. British banking interests, British life insurance and other insurance interests, and British general commercial interests which do with India a business exceeding \$1,000,000,000 gross a year will be nationalized under independent India.

Last year India imported \$435,000,000 worth of British goods. Independent India will determine for herself with whom she will trade.

Just a few figures will give you the dollars and cents interpretation of India in English life, and dollars and cents are understood generally by the American public better than all the theories in the world. (Laughter) Perhaps that will make you understand why I state we may have to go through a bloody struggle to achieve our independence. What for?

We are striving to achieve a society in India in which our humblest worker, unskilled worker, will be assured of an income, a wage, a certain minimum living wage which will not be less than the wage paid for similar labor in any part of the world. To assure our humblest citizen a living wage which will be determined not by his heredity, not by his race, religion, color, or creed, (or by what you call in America his "latitude and longitude,") but by the amount of his productive skill, and the decent need of our society, is the fundamental basis of Indian nationalism. To translate that into practical use, we have undertaken the tremendous task of achieving our independence. Independent India alone can assure us our ideal.

To assure continued prosperity to our people we shall have to industrialize India, and as you do in this country, we shall have to protect our domestic market with tariff barriers. We shall have to take recourse to

state aid to industries and also we may have to go a step farther than you do in organizing cooperatives to distribute and market India's industrial and agricultural products. We shall have to take recourse to any and every possible means and we know we cannot do that so long as Britain maintains her control in India in any shape or form.

England has built up a vicious system which compels England, for her very existence, to depend on the export of sixty per cent of her manufactured products, as also on her coal. Fully eighty per cent of British commercial life is dependent on her export trade. The forty million Britishers do not consume more than thirty-five per cent of the goods that they manufacture. That explains why England cannot afford to give her wage earners a living or a social wage.

The British domestic market is a poor consumer of British manufactures. The consuming power of any nation depends on the earning power of its nationals and when a nation has to depend to such a large extent on her export trade that nation cannot be expected to give a living wage to her wage earners.

England cannot afford to give a living wage to the wage earners in any of her dependencies. High wages in those dependencies primarily depend on a protected domestic market, and if those dependencies have the right to protect their domestic market certainly they will erect tariff barriers to shut out English products from their market, and it is the enforced markets in those dependencies that sustain England in the modern world.

These facts and these figures will show you why India with 320,000,000 people, three times the population of the United States, consumed less than \$6,000,000,000 last year, and why you with your 110,000,000 consumed more than \$115,000,000,000. That ought to open the eyes of the progressive leaders of this country and of the world to the potentialities of an independent India built on the high wage doctrine.

Viewed from this angle, England is the greatest menace to the modern civilization which strives to build up a society assuring every humble worker a decent, a living and a social wage. You have been spontaneously, almost unconsciously, building up such a civilization in your glorious country in spite of all your internal differences and your "noble experiments." (Laughter) We have been striving to achieve for our people what you have been striving and accomplishing for your own.

Independent India will be the dominating cause of world peace. A subjugated India is the exciting cause of international rivalries, jealousies and the lust of conquest in the imperialistic powers of the world. The

possession by the sword of India by Britain has aroused similar desires for colonial possessions in other European powers who imitate Britain in their tactics; it has stimulated a desire in other European nationals to hold on to their possessions with their armies and their navies.

It is because of India, that Gibraltar is British. It is because of India that Malta is British today. It is because of India that Port Said is British and that Egyptians have lost their independence. It is because of India that Aden is British, that Singapore is British, that Hongkong is British.

Why did England fight more wars in the last two centuries than any other power in the world? Because of India. Because of India she wants the biggest navy in the world and because of India you people in America will have to have an upward reduction of your navy (laughter), to have American naval parity with England which has been granted so generously to you by Mr. MacDonald—not this Mr. McDonald. (Laughter) Because of India, France wants 800,000 tons. Because of India, Italy and Japan will have to meet the British challenge and will be demanding in a few days naval parity with the other powers of the world. World navalism exists today because of India. Mark that word.

Navalism, militarism, commercialism and imperialism thrive on the subjection of one people by another, and this must be banished from the face of the earth before the nations of the world can honestly, can sincerely begin to think of renouncing war as an instrument of national policy. I hope both Mr. Kellogg and Mr. Briand will live to see that day.

India has challenged.

India's independence will be the only cause and will be the only assurance of world peace and universal disarmament.

I haven't taken thirty minutes. (Laughter) Thank you. (Applause)

THE CHAIRMAN: The second speaker is an Englishman, Mr. Edward Thompson, guest professor of English at Vassar this winter, who lived in India for many years and for a long time was education missionary and principal of a large school there. Since 1923, he has been responsible for teaching Bengali to the Indian Civil Service students at Oxford. He is the author of "An Indian Day," "Night Falls On Siva's Hill," and "A History of India."

We should be glad to welcome Mr. Thompson to our platform at any time, but we are particularly glad to welcome him today, after Mr. Ghose's talk, because we should like to see what an Englishman looks like. Those of you of the radio audience who can't see will be glad to hear what an Englishman sounds like. Mr. Thompson! (Applause)

MR. EDWARD THOMPSON

*M*R. McDONALD, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: With the meetings of the last National Congress at Lahore, that body has leapt into the place of front page news. Many things—the very name of Congress, the setting apart of Independence Day, and other things, have encouraged the American people to believe that they now see reenacted, before their own eyes, the events of their own Revolutionary War. And that belief has been sedulously fostered by those responsible for the publicity of the Congress.

Mr. Ghose has given you many bouquets. I shall give you none, because I have not the time. (Laughter) But, I will instead pay you the high compliment of trying to put before you a reasoned statement. (Applause)

The Congress began in 1885. It was largely the creation of an English official, and in its early years it had at least six English presidents. It would have had another in 1911, in Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, our present Prime Minister, but the death of his wife prevented him from going to India.

The Congress was a great means of political education. It moved its meetings about all over India. There are today, about two thousand delegates. The qualification was to pay a rupee a year, but that has been raised to five rupees. That is about six and eight pence, about a dollar and a half.

These delegates are elected, some of them, at public meetings, some of them by local groups, and it is not unfair to say that some are elected by themselves. (Laughter)

Besides the delegates, there is a large overflow attendance. I believe at the last Lahore Congress it amounted to about 30,000 people.

Even if information and knowledge are not disseminated, excitement must be, and it is nonsense to say that the Congress does not matter.

For a long time, the Congress was generally representative of Hindu political thought. The Moslems were aloof from it to a great extent, and during its early years the things that the Congress asked for were very moderate, things that ought to have been granted long ago and which since have all been granted.

In the early years, the aim of political Indians, and of most liberal Englishmen alike, was, by a gradual process of infiltration into the services

of India, to give Indians an increasing share in the administration of their country. But about the end of the last century, the Indians began to feel that that process was too slow and too reluctant, and that they must get hold of the political machine, must control legislation as well as share in administration.

It was after the War, in what are known as the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms of 1919—they came into operation in 1921—that the first attempt that really matters, (and it was a tremendous step forward) was made to give Indians a genuine share in the government of their own country. Those reforms are sketched in the papers which you have before you. The two things I want to stress now are, first of all, that India had developed a quasi-Federal constitution. There was a Central government, and under that Central government there were Provinces. Today there are nine Provinces. These Provinces are very large. They all had tiny legislatures. By the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms, those legislatures were very greatly enlarged, and the revenues and expenditures of the Central and Provincial governments were made distinct. Before that there had been much confusion. But the great thing that those reforms did was what is called diarchy—division of government. Subjects were divided into reserved and transferred, and a certain number of portfolios were transferred to Indian ministers who were responsible to an elected legislature—not entirely elected, but with a majority of elected members.

Among the subjects that were transferred were what are called the “great nation-building subjects,” health and sanitation, education, agriculture, and things like that.

The Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms, and particularly this principle of diarchy, have found few friends. As a matter of fact, I do not think as badly of the program as most people. I think it might have been a valuable way of training Indians in the government of their own country, if it had not been for psychological factors, and the thing that we must remember is this: I am sorry to repeat things, but what has made affairs in India go wrong so badly in the last ten years more often than not has been some psychological factor.

A very much smaller measure of reform in 1909 had been received by Indians with enthusiasm, the Morley-Minto Reforms. The Congress spoke of “lively gratitude,” but the very much greater measure of self-government of 1919 was rejected with contempt and anger. The reason was psychological. There were many reasons. But the two best known to the outside world are Amritsar and the humiliation felt by Mohammedans with Turkish positions after the war which led to what they called

the Kalifat Movement, a movement which demanded that Turkey be kept in all her old position and all her old territory.

In my opinion, that demand was one impossible to grant. We could not have kept France out of Syria without a war, and we had neither the right nor the power to force the Arabs back under the suzerainty of the Sultan. But in Mr. Gandhi's own words, it gave him "the opportunity of a hundred years" to unite Hindus and Mohammedans.

In April, 1919, there happened the tragedy of Amritsar, where a British general was shot down at a public meeting. But even Amritsar, by itself, would not have made things go wrong. As late as December, 1919, Mr. Gandhi himself said he was in favor of trying to work the reforms. If it had not been that our House of Lords, after General Dyer had been condemned by every responsible authority in India and England, had not passed a resolution exonerating him; and also, that in India the British community which still lives under the shadow of a great fear, the fear that it spread by the accounts of the Mutiny given in our books, in its anger at the disgrace of General Dyer, collected 26,000 pounds and presented it to him—if it had not been for these two things, there would have been no non-cooperation. That pro-Dyer agitation, in my judgment, (and I was one of those who took the unpopular side) was a thing that shocked Indian sentiment much more than even the event of Amritsar.

So Mr. Gandhi hit on non-cooperation. No Indian was to serve in any government position. No Indian was to stand for election to the Councils.

This event accelerated the alignment and separation of India which has been going on especially during the last year.

In 1907, the Moslems had founded their own league, the Moslem League. When non-cooperation came, for a time Mr. Gandhi brought about a union of many Mohammedans with Hindus. But at the same time Indians who were willing to work the reforms founded what is known as the Liberal League. And so leagues began to spring up, associations began to be formed.

The reforms were worked in a sort of fashion up to 1923. In 1922 Mr. Gandhi was sent to prison. It was an extremely good thing that he was sent to prison. If he had not been sent to prison, he would have been dead in another six months. We saved his life by sending him there. (Laughter) He was traveling about India from station to station and at every station the people demanded *darshan*, which means a ceremonial sight of a person whose view is auspicious. Mr. Gandhi would be dragged out at two o'clock in the morning for *darshan*, dragged out again at two-thirty. He could not have stood the pace very much longer. His trial

was a wonderful thing. I remember the amazing silence with which India, of all races, looked towards that trial. People expected an outbreak, but there was none.

Mr. Gandhi himself received the most beautiful courtesy from the public prosecutor and from the judge, and he was taken into consultation as to what should be the sentence inflicted upon him. Mr. Gandhi, in broken-hearted words, said that he agreed with all the public prosecutor said and could have said much more as to his responsibility for all the bloodshed that had disgraced India since his non-cooperation came in, and at the same time he added that if he were left free he would do the same thing tomorrow. He agreed that the judge could not inflict a lesser sentence than six years' imprisonment. The judge himself said that if it proved possible, from a change in the political situation, for the government to release Mr. Gandhi before the six years were up, no one would be better pleased than he would be himself.

Mr. Gandhi, as you know, was released. There came that emergency operation after which he was set free that he might recover his health, and set free unconditionally.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, from that trial I date the great change that has come over my countrymen in India. We have many faults, but we do know a man when we see one, and that frail, emaciated figure, the man who had tried so hard to cooperate during many years, who in South Africa had welded together his own countrymen of every race and creed, against conditions that most Englishmen felt were intolerable, that man with his queer mixture of good humor, sense of humor, courage, obstinacy and impracticability, won our respect as he had never done before, and won also our affection.

I believe that Mr. Gandhi's trial, which revealed as it did the essential "decency" that lies in the heart of both the contending peoples in India today, did more than anything else to bring about the much better situation that, in spite of newspapers, exists today.

It was also a great convenience to Mr. Gandhi's own followers. Many of them had been against non-cooperation, and had accepted it unwillingly because of his great personal prestige. While he was in prison, the 1923 elections approached, and the Congress, after several failures, held a special meeting at Delhi, and resolved to enter the Councils. Mr. Mahomed Ali, the Mohammedan leader who had accompanied Mr. Gandhi on his *darshan* journeys through India, announced that he had a message by telepathy from Mr. Gandhi in jail saying that Mr. Gandhi now wished the non-cooperators to enter the Councils. Well, they entered the Councils,

but mostly for wrecking purposes and in two of the nine provinces the reforms were made impossible and came to an end.

The situation which became increasingly chaotic in 1927, was rendered almost impossible by two events. The first was the sending of the Simon Commission to report to the British Parliament on conditions in India. The Simon Commission consists solely of seven members of the British Parliament. Its appointment was made in the most tactless way possible, and was taken by practically all India as an intolerable insult.

The second thing was the publication of "Mother India," which was widely believed all over India to have been encouraged by the government. Indians are particularly sensitive today as to the shadow that they cast upon world opinion, and as to outside belief concerning their practices. It is not possible to exaggerate the political effect of "Mother India."

Sir John Simon, of whom a Swarajist said on one occasion, "He is not Sir John Simon; he is Sir John Siren," saw the mistake that had been made and in February, 1928, addressed a letter to the Viceroy, in which he proposed a "Joint Free Conference"; that the Indian legislatures should elect seven members to meet with the British on a basis of equality and send up their report either with the British or separately.

That proposal was rejected by one of the two central legislatures; the Central government has a bicameral legislature; but the other, the Council of State, accepted. And in the end, the majority of the provincial legislatures consented to cooperate, and elected their own seven members whose report has just been published, last December. We are still waiting for the Simon report.

That was in 1928. At the National Congress of 1928, after a fierce argument,—oh, I ought to go back a minute. Lord Birkenhead had thrown out words that were accepted by Indian leaders as a challenge. He had suggested that if Indians could draw up "an agreed scheme" for self-government, it would be very difficult, if not impossible, for any party in England to refuse that. Indians looked on this as a challenge, and a committee was appointed which drew up a constitution for India, known from the name of its chairman, Mr. Motilal Nehru, as the Nehru report. That report was published in August, 1928, and the constitution which it drew up was meant to be applied in the case of either independence or dominion status.

Unfortunately, the Nehru constitution was fissured with disagreement; and from that time to this, the process of alignment has been going on very rapidly in India. Let me just briefly set its outlines before you.

The Congress in December, 1928, after a long discussion, gave the British Parliament and the British government, exactly twelve calendar months in which to accept, without changing a comma, the constitution that they had drawn up, or else to submit to civil disobedience.

Three days later, the All-India Moslem League meeting at Delhi, which represented the great majority of Mohammedans, rejected the Nehru constitution in a series of resolutions so belligerently framed that they rang out like a lot of pistol shots. In February, 1929, the Indian princes (who govern 23 per cent of the population of India, and 40 per cent of its area), passed unanimously a resolution that, "in view of the drift of certain politicians of British India towards independence," this house wished to set on record its resolution that it could not consent to any transference to another government "except on the basis of the British connection."

So the year passed on, and people wondered what the Congress would do when the twelve months of grace came to an end.

Then we had our Labor government. You will remember that the Premier himself at one time would have been president of the National Congress if he could have gotten to India, and he is known to be sympathetic towards Indian aspirations.

In November of last year, the Viceroy, after consultation with the Secretary of State for India, announced publicly that dominion status was the accepted goal to which the government was working, and asked for a round table conference of the princes, the government, and the people of British India. Every year, during the last seven years, the Congress has clamored for such a round table conference, and in the Nehru constitution itself, the Congress, speaking through its appointed representatives, has said that "if ever there was a case for a round table conference, at which differences could be easily and amicably settled, it was this question" of the people of British India and of the princes.

Nevertheless, although there seemed signs that the Congress would deviate into statesmanship, at Lahore last December, the round table conference was rejected, and Mr. Jawarhalal Nehru, the young president of the Congress, a man of twenty-nine,* who was educated at Harrow and came back from Soviet Russia fifteen months ago, whose views are much more extreme than his father's, Mr. Motilal Nehru (the chairman of the committee that drew up the constitution), in his presidential speech spoke of the princes as "puppets" as "relics of a bygone age" as, most of them, "personally, without a single redeeming feature" and generally defied them.

*This statement was corrected by Mr. Rezmie and others, during the discussion.

By that speech he rendered any peaceable settlement between the independent princes of India and the people of British India extremely difficult.

At the same time, the other parties of India were separating and taking their places under their own individual flags. First of all, the European Associations—and this to me is one of the strangest things of all—in Bombay and Calcutta passed resolutions in their councils welcoming the Viceroy's pronouncement. The Calcutta European Association said that it "clarified the issue, already clear to all competent observers," and could do nothing but good. The Liberal League, the Hindus and the Mohammedans who believe in a peaceful settlement welcomed it. The Justice party, which represents the great non-Brahmin element of South India, also welcomed it. Finally, on the last day of the Congress itself, another fissure appeared when Mr. Subashchandra Bose, the most militant extremist leader in India, Commander-in-Chief of the League of Youth, which believes in violence, after quarreling with the President, walked out followed by thirty others. It is said that one of them remarked, as he went out, that, since they had been taught to walk out of the Councils, they could easily walk out of the National Congress as well.

Ladies and gentlemen, the choice before India is not a choice between freedom and slavery. It is a choice between becoming a weaker Mexico, a more ridiculous China, or starting upon a path that will lead India to prosperity and entire self-respect. (Applause) There is no other choice.

I do hope there are going to be questions from the floor. I do hope that my friend, Mr. Ghose, is going to be asked, for instance, about his allegations that we force opium on the mothers of India, and I hope he will be asked also about the proposal to confiscate the British investments in India. I hope he will be asked too about the extent to which Great Britain prevents India from protecting her own industries and putting on tariffs, and I hope you will ask me questions too.

The first snag, of course, is the princes. As I said, they govern 23 per cent of the people, 40 per cent of the land. The princes—of the three parties concerned, they, the British government and the people of British India—are the party that is most awake. They have been, for years, watching developments. They have developed a considerable power of corporate action. They have money and spend it freely on legal help. One of the most interesting things of recent years was the demand by the premier prince, the Nizam of Hyderabad, in 1923 and 1925, to negotiate with the British government on terms of absolute equality. That claim was rejected, not too politely, by the Viceroy. I think, ladies and gentlemen, few more interesting and dramatic things have happened in

our time than that episode of an Indian prince claiming that he was free and independent—before a background of watching princes, who would put forward the same claim if they thought it had any chance.

If a settlement is not arrived at with the princes, there will be disaster. Mr. Ghose says, "Blood will flow." I think it will. But another thing that will happen is this: There will be economic chaos in India. I hope you will ask me for details of what I mean.

The second thing—I have to get on quickly—the second snag in the way of this clear-cut solution, complete independence, is defence. I hope, again, you will ask me for details of what I mean. But you can see yourselves that India is helpless at sea and that she has an exposed frontier on the north, against which lie two powers who are immune from Kellogg pacts or the League of Nations, or any of the other things that we have developed to control and localize war. They are Afghanistan and Russia.

The third thing, of course, is the communal troubles, especially the quarrels between Hindus and Mohammedans, which of recent years have become nothing more nor less than a disease preying on the body politic. All patriotic Hindus and Mohammedans want to get rid of those quarrels, but at present Hindus and Mohammedans often seem much more bent on killing one another, and often for the most trivial causes, than on uniting against the supposed oppressor in their midst.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I believe that, in spite of the papers, a peaceful solution was never nearer. I believe that, if during this year, we can keep the extremists on both sides from mischief, a peaceful solution will be arrived at. I believe it is within reach of all but impatient and angry hands. I consider that the Viceroy's action deserves a moment of dispassionate comment. It was generous, as the strong can afford to be generous, but rarely are. There was no standing upon dignity in face of a "dare." There was no attempt to force the Congress into the extreme difficulty of their own unjustifiable demand. On the contrary, he left it open to the Congress to save their face; to say, if they liked, that they had frightened the government into yielding; and to say, if they wished to be statesmen, that, since the principle had been granted, they could waive the minor matter of time and allow a sufficient time for the whole, complex field of Indian affairs to be discussed dispassionately and for bad temper to evaporate (as it cannot do if things are rushed).

Many of us have looked forward to this day and have worked for it. It has been a deep distress to us that we are not guests in the midst of India, and we believe that in a short time we shall be guests, and that we shall be welcome.

There are so many things there that want development. I would just refer for a moment to the Mohammedans. The Mohammedans of India are destined to be the bridge by which Islam passes to the modern world. India herself—overpopulated, very much in need of having her social customs overhauled, and her whole system of thought faced as fearlessly as we have faced ours—India herself has some of the most beautiful and unspoiled languages in the world, and I believe that by her connection with England, she will reach the outer world, and that she was meant to do that.

There is a chance now for men of good will. I have a whole list of things that I meant to have mentioned, but I hope there will be questions asked about them. (Laughter) I had outlined a list of the things that I thought ought to be done, something like a practical program, but I have no time for it. I only wish to say this: That I think the action of the Congress was the action of despair. Mr. Gandhi was swept off his feet by the young men, the extremists. When you look at the action of the Congress you must not look at the voting; you must look at what is called the "Subjects Committee." It consists of two hundred people. And that resolution for complete independence, after a fierce fight in the Subjects Committee, was carried by 114 votes to 77. So it is pretty clear that in the Congress itself, although it has been becoming increasingly extremist, there is something not far short of half the membership which is in favor of a peaceful solution on the dominion basis. (Applause)

THE CHAIRMAN: The subject is open for discussion. Both Mr. Ghose and Mr. Thompson, the one by implication and the other by direct suggestion, have asked for questions; and I should welcome questions addressed to either of the speakers before I venture to request anyone else to take part formally in the discussion. Where is the first question? May I suggest that, if some of you have been habitual questioners at these meetings, we might perhaps get a greater diversity of questions if you let some others try first. (Laughter) Where is someone with a question who hasn't asked one recently?

MRS. JENKINS: *I would like to have Mr. Thompson give us his practical program.*

MR. THOMPSON: First of all, vague generalities. I think my people must develop the dominion status attitude. I think we must try, as we never have tried before, to take Indians in on the ground floor. I think we must overhaul our writing of Indian history, which is the least gen-

erous part of all our scholarship. On the other hand, I think Indians, who are so touchy about outside criticism, must overhaul their whole system of thought and bring it up-to-date. I think it is ridiculous for them to be as touchy as they are.

If you care to go back a hundred years, you will find that the people of this country and of my country were pretty bad in sanitation and in health methods. You will find also that it isn't so very long since we had a certain amount of child marriages ourselves. I think it is time that they overhaul their whole system of thought and bring it up-to-date.

Then to come to practical things, first of all, I think that the nine provinces should be given a system of government completely responsible in every portfolio to an elected legislature. Secondly, for a time I would like to see law and order and the army reserved to the central government. And I would like to have an arrangement by which India would attain full and absolute dominion status in every detail automatically at the end of a short period of years, without the humiliation of any more committees or commissions or inquiries. (Applause) I want these ten years because I think we ought to push forward a big scheme of compulsory primary education all over India. (Applause)

The best thing that has happened since the reforms came in has been the great improvement in education. It was handed over to Indian ministers, and in spite of tremendous difficulties they have done very well. They have made more progress in ten years with primary education than we had done in many decades before, partly because they could get in touch with local land-owners and local leaders as the British government could not.

And I should like to see the last stage, as the historian of the future will see it, of the British rule in India begin at once. The historian of the future looking back at the history of India will distinguish four stages: First, up to 1857, there was the stage of conquest and settlement. Between 1857 and about 1910 there was the stage of administration, when individual officers did their best but there was no great coordination and there was no attempt to get to the back of things, to the real problems; they were dealt with piecemeal as they arose. This overlaps the third period. Toward the end of the last century, instead of simply administering famine relief and trying to check plague, and trying to help when plagues were on, we tried to eradicate the causes of famine. We tried to eradicate plague altogether and tear it out root and branch. So, in the third stage, there was an attempt to tackle the problems of India not piecemeal but in their sources and at the same time to guide Indians in self-government and fit them to take over the machinery of their country.

The fourth stage is beginning now. When Mr. Gandhi was asked if there is a place for Englishmen in India said, "Yes, there is a great place. Englishmen are welcome in India if they will come there to serve us."

I hope that now the Englishmen who stay in India will have that in mind. And let me say that my countrymen, however much they may have disapproved of the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms, almost without exception have loyally tried to work them. You need not be afraid that the average Englishman will not do what he considers his job even if he thinks the government is mistaken. I hope that during the next ten years (and I believe this) the Englishmen who stay on in India will definitely as never before regard themselves as servants of the Indian people, and if we can develop *pari passu* in India and in England this dominion status attitude and if our Dominions also will help us by considering Indian susceptibilities, I believe that we shall have a peaceful solution with a very much happier and a very much more prosperous India than we see today in a very short term of years. (Applause)

MISS KOSHLAND: *I would like to ask Mr. Ghose whether the independence of India includes the freedom of all her people and the doing away with the cast system and what plan he has for educating this great mass of people that cannot be taught today.*

MR. GHOSE: Independent India stands uncompromisingly for the abolition of the caste system and of all other social vices that exist today. (Applause)

I stated that if I am prepared to lay down my life for any cause, and if any of my people is prepared to lay down his life for any cause, it is the cause of assuring the humblest citizen of India—irrespective of caste, color, creed, heredity, or birth—a living income. We stand moreover not only for compulsory education both for boys and girls but we shall adopt the system that prevailed in India before the British came, that the expenses of all the students, young men and young women, who go to school shall be provided by the state. That was the system that existed in India and that will be the system tomorrow if we have our independence.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next question is: *Will Mr. Ghose kindly explain the opium situation in India?* I might suggest to Mr. Ghose that I hope that will not require a half-hour address. Let's say three minutes.

MR. GHOSE: Well, we will have to "dope" you people in three minutes. Let's see if we can do it. (Laughter)

Opium is a government monopoly maintained by the government who advances money without interest to the cultivators. But I think I can

answer that question in just a few words, and I will quote the words of the man who today occupies Number 10 Downing Street, words uttered before he lost his sensibility by going there. (Laughter)

The Right Honorable James Ramsay MacDonald, the present Premier of England, in his work, "Government of India," published by The Viking Press of this city, on page 125 has this to say about opium:

"It sacrificed national interests of India in order to make profits. It ordered the ploughing of the fields of poppies when its stock of opium was sufficient and did not want to depress prices. At another time and for the same business reason it decreed planting of the poppy crop instead of grain."

Opium today is given by the government agents (they do the propaganda) to our ignorant, illiterate, unknowing mothers, who have to work for their living, at seven, eight, nine or ten cents a day, for ten hours in the factories and mills of India, advising those mothers to give little white pills manufactured by the government in the opium plant at Ghazipur to their babies so that the babies will keep quiet and they can come back from work and nurse their babies, after ten hours of hard work.

It is done by the government, at the instigation of the government, and all the advertisements for the same are printed and distributed through the government printing office. Mr. C. F. Andrews (I wish he were here but he is not) is the one who unearthed this condition at Bombay only a couple of years ago. Ninety-eight per cent of the babies born in Bombay are drugged and 826 out of every 1,000 babies born in India in such districts die before they are a year old. And that is being done by the government, by the so-called Christian, ungodly, and in reality un-Christian government!

The prelates of Canterbury and York are talking about protecting their religion in Russia. They have a problem right before their own noses, and if they were a little bit honest and sincere they could go down and take care of the ungodly, un-Christian, inhuman and ghastly thing that exists regarding the opium question so far as India is concerned.
(Applause)

THE CHAIRMAN: I have asked Mr. Thompson to give his interpretation of the opium problem in India—in another three minutes.

MR. THOMPSON: Nobody defends what Great Britain did before 1907. When she came to India she found the opium habit established and she made it a government monopoly. In 1907 after a unanimous vote by our House of Commons, a unanimous vote of over six hundred

people, we came to an agreement with China that in ten years we would get rid of the poppy if she would also get rid of her own poppy-growing industry and stop exporting it. In 1913, four years before the time was up, satisfied that China had done her best, we stopped the export trade to China absolutely.

Now then, there are two sides to the opium question. There is the export which is under the control of the Central government. There is the internal consumption which is under the Provincial governments, part of the "transferred subjects."

The external position is this: First of all, in India between 1916 and 1927 the area that was given up to the growing of the poppy was reduced by over 76 per cent, from 204,000 acres to 48,000 acres. It is being reduced progressively because we have promised that within ten years from 1925, by 1935, the export trade of opium would cease absolutely, the opium exported under government certificate. The country that wishes to export opium has to give the government of India a certificate for the amount that it wants, and it is handed over from one government to the other. It is exported to seven countries, and by the way, if I may say so without offense, because none is meant, you spend a lot of time discussing the sins of my people—why don't you look at this: Among those countries there are the Dutch East Indies, there is French Cochin-China, there is Portuguese Macao. Those countries, by the Geneva Agreement, are pledged to get rid of their opium consumption within fifteen years. If they do their share as well as the government of India is doing its share, it will very soon come to an end.

Then I turn to internal consumption. The great trouble with the native states is smuggling, but in one year 1923 to 1924, the opium grown in the native states was reduced by 48 per cent.

And now I want to ask Mr. Ghose one question: Since 1921 opium has been a "transferred subject." The internal consumption of opium is entirely in the hands of nine out of the ten provinces. It was "reserved" in only one province. Therefore it is in the hands of the Indians themselves. In several of those provinces Mr. Ghose's party, the Swaraj party, is in the majority. If they wished at any time to bring in a drastic measure of legislation making the eating of opium or the smoking of it prohibited in India (and, by the way, the *smoking* of it is prohibited in India), if they cared to bring in a drastic measure of reform, absolute prohibition, they could have carried it in nine out of the ten provinces.

Mr. Ghose's answer to that will be that the central government would veto it. But in 1923 at the League of Nations, the fifth assembly of the

League of Nations, Lord Hardinge (who had been Viceroy of India and who was the delegate from India) expressly said that if the Indian provincial legislatures wished to carry any scheme of opium reform the central government not only would not use its exceptional power of veto, but would cooperate in every way that it could, and that assurance was repeated in 1925 by Mr. Walton who was also the representative of the Indian government at the League of Nations. (Applause)

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Thompson has asked a question and I assume he ought to have priority since it is addressed to Mr. Ghose, and it in effect is: *What did Mr. Ghose's party do about opium in the provincial legislatures?*

MR. GHOSE: Regarding the opium question, the Indian National Congress and my party stand uncompromisingly for the total abolition of the cultivation of the poppy plant. We have brought that forward even to Geneva. We have passed resolutions as late as March 10, 1926. In the Indian Legislative Assembly one of the leaders of our party asked the government to stop the cultivation of the poppy plant entirely, which Mr. Thompson's representative refused.

In answering the question Mr. Thompson told you that 76 per cent of the acreage has been cut down. That has been done not because the government wanted it to go down but because the people refused to cultivate the poppy plant, because of the work of Gandhi and other social reformers.

In 1921, Mr. Wild, the Opium Agent at Ghazipur, (on the 18th of January 1921) submitted the following to the government (and I am quoting from his speech delivered at the Indian Legislative Assembly by Dr. S. K. Datta, published by the Foreign Policy Association):

“The season was again an unfortunate one for the crop the yield was disappointing. This misfortune was accentuated as wheat, the chief competing crop, did not suffer and gave excellent results.

“The thanks of the Department are due to Mr. H. Young and Pandit Champa Ram, Special Managers, Court of Wards, for their assistance in inducing the men on their estates to engage for poppy. Quite an appreciable area was obtained through their help.”

I cannot “dope” you as much as I should like to in one minute.

The question was brought out right here during the last year. It even continued as late as March, 1926. At that time Dr. Datta asked this question of the government: “Is the British government aware that during the War opium was issued by the Supply and Transport to certain Indian

personnel when on active service? If so, will the government state under what conditions this was done?"

During the war we had 1,400,000 soldiers unfortunately recruited by Mr. Gandhi, to make the world safe for hypocrisy, and when they went to Europe and died in the trenches they were given how much? Twenty grains per man per day of opium.

That is right in the government report published by the Foreign Policy Association.

That is the kind of work they are doing in India! That is the kind of work of which they want to keep you uninformed. (Applause)

THE CHAIRMAN: I am going to venture to suggest that, instead of another question just now, I call on two other Indians here, who represent somewhat different points of view from Mr. Ghose or at least approach the question somewhat differently, for a five-minute talk from each of them. I am going to ask, first, whether Mr. Daniel Jivanayakam will talk to us for five minutes. Mr. Jivanayakam is Honorary Reader in Education at the University of Madras, Lecturer at Teachers' College at Trivandrum in Travancore, South India, and now Macy Fellow at Teachers' College, Columbia University. Mr. Jivanayakam! (Applause)

MR. DANIEL JIVANAYAKAM

I HAVE been requested by the Chair to talk to you for four or five minutes, and I think can most profitably use that time by giving you some idea of the difference between the extreme complete independence view, the now almost defunct bureaucratic view of British domination, and the middle road represented by the Moderate party which asks for dominion status as a free Indian nation in the great commonwealth of free nations known as the British Empire.

When the Congress was holding its annual session in Lahore last December and voting for complete independence and non-participation in the round table conference to be held in London with a view to revising the Constitution of India, the Moderates, under the name of the National Liberal Federation, met in Madras and voted for dominion status and for participation in the round table conference to be held in London. The Moderates came to this view after careful consideration of the pros and cons. They were with the Congress in 1927-28 chiefly because the Simon Commission was appointed over the heads of the Indian Nationalist party and found that in a commission appointed to revise the Indian Constitu-

tion there was no representative for India in its ranks. They thought that was an insult to India, that India should have no say about the constitution by which it was to be governed. Now that the Labor party has undone the mischief and called together a round table conference in which Indians are to have their own representatives and their own say on the revision of the constitution they think that the one reason which made them vote against participation with the government no longer exists.

So that in Madras under the presidency of Sir Pheroze Sethna, and with the assistance of such distinguished Indians as Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, and a number of others who are known all over India as experienced administrators they passed a resolution saying that they will participate in the round table conference with a view to arriving at dominion status. They came to this conclusion as I said before after carefully considering the pros and cons.

If the complete independence view is taken, it cannot be arrived at without force as it is advocated by the younger party within the Congress. You cannot ask one of the most powerful nations on the face of the earth to quietly walk out of India where they have been for the last two hundred years, where they had formed the center of their foreign policy for so long a time, and where millions of their national capital is invested. You cannot possibly ask a nation like that to walk out without resisting. (Applause)

Therefore they think that unless you can summon in force and drive them out the best thing to do is to persuade them in the new way of persuasion which is common all over the world for settling disputes, persuade them to yield a greater and greater part to Indians in the government of their own land.

They also believe that in the absence of such force talk of revolution and confiscation of foreign capital merely frightens commercial interests in England and stiffens the opposition to yield greater and greater amounts of self-government to India.

Therefore, they believe it is necessary for them to make a statement of their own case, to make a declaration of their own principles, and to stand out for participation with Britain in the attempt to grant them complete dominion status.

If we don't have force, there is another alternative which is known all over the world now because it has been sponsored by Mahatma Gandhi. Mahatma Gandhi would, by means of soul force, not mere physical brutal force, make the British get out of India. The only way for us to

judge this aspect of the question is to hark back to 1921 when the Non-Cooperation Movement tried passive resistance and non-violence. It led to bloodshed everywhere, bloodshed which was regretted by everybody and by none more than by Mahatma Gandhi.

This idea of soul force and passive resistance demands a great deal of human nature which it cannot grant and therefore, again, the Moderates believe that however great may be the man who started this idea, it is impractical in the actual field of politics, and therefore they stand out for complete dominion status.

Complete dominion status will solve many problems. It will give independence to India. It will enable India to have its own protective tariff and thereby defend herself against economic depredation by a very powerful country like England. It will also save a million nationals who live outside India in the British Empire. It will settle their question amicably. It is the only way which will be welcomed by the princes of the native states in India. And, again, we already know that popular government in India has had only a short history. It was in 1909 that the Morley-Minto Reforms were granted. Ten years later we had the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms, and again in 1929 the whole question was raised before the British Parliament and the Indian peoples. Therefore they say, "We have had but a short period of popular government and we have achieved a great deal. Why not proceed along the same lines, especially because it seems to be the line of least resistance?"

My time is up. (Applause)

THE CHAIRMAN: We have only fifteen minutes more, but I should like to give five of those minutes to another Indian speaker, who I think considers himself thoroughly Indian, although as a matter of fact he is an Afghan born in India. So I call now on Mr. T. H. K. Rezmie, formerly Editor of the *Eastern World*, and the founder of THE INDIA INDEPENDENCE LEAGUE OF AMERICA. The first Indian speaker spoke perhaps, if from any religious view at all, as a Hindu, the second as a Christian, and I present to you Mr. Rezmie, who is a Moslem. (Applause)

MR. T. H. K. REZMIE

*M*R. CHAIRMAN AND FRIENDS: This debate has brought out a great many more provocative points than I had anticipated in the wildest of my dreams (laughter), but the limitations of time must pre-

vail. There is just one point about which I want to correct my friend, Mr. Thompson.

Jawaharlal Nehru, the President of the Indian National Congress, is not twenty-nine. He is forty-one. And that is a mature enough age to know what he is doing with the knife of authority in his hand.

Mr. Thompson has dilated considerably on the change of policy of the administrators of India, especially of the Viceroy, and Mr. Ramsay MacDonald.

There has been a great deal said in the praise of Lord Irwin for his November declaration. All that has been said, and a good deal more, would have been perfectly justifiable if that declaration meant anything. Unfortunately, he himself was driven to confess that that declaration was simply a vague picture of what might be the possible future of India; that the thought originated in his own mind and was declared on his own personal responsibility. Whether the opposing parties in the British Parliament,—not only the Opposition but even the government party,—were in favor of this rather “recklessly idealistic” step of Lord Irwin’s, were in favor of this statement, or not, has been left for us to guess. The fact is, however, that when the Indian Nationalist leaders, two days before the meeting of the Congress of Lahore, waited upon His Excellency, not entirely on their own initiative, in order once and for all to clarify their conception of the exact intention in the mind of the speaker of those fateful words of November first, Lord Irwin admitted that he was not in a position to say whether the round table conference, scheduled for some time this year, was going to draft a constitution of dominion status in India.

Let this be clearly understood: That if dominion status, were to be accepted on the agenda as the basis for what goes on in the London round table conference, Mr. Gandhi, I say to you, would still be willing to send Indian National delegates to “talk it over.” (Applause)

There are a few points that have been brought up about Mr. Gandhi. Between an extreme militant Nationalist, like Mr. Ghose, and an extremely cautious and mild Moderate like Daniel Jivanayakam, it is difficult to protect Mr. Gandhi, who does not happen to be present here. But he really does not need to be protected. His principle of using “soul force,” as against brute force in the struggle against the British government, which has seemed futile to the previous speakers, is not one of blowing away the British troops by his spiritual breath. It is one of making human beings so completely self-dependent, so completely self-conscious, so completely strong in their mind, in their spirit, in their determination as to

what they want and how they will get it, that no force on earth, not even the mighty British Empire, would be able to change their course.

There is no attempt on the part of Mr. Gandhi to evade the issue of blood, if it should come. But he has said over and over again, that if it comes, it will not come by the hands of the Indians.

To what extent he will be permitted to carry his program through, only the future can tell. But it would be well for you not to be carried away by the sensationalized, dramatic and false impressions and anticipations which are created through your press, news agencies, and the flamboyant, militaristic utterances of both sides.

I invite you to keep in touch with the India Independence League of America, recently organized in New York City by American Liberals—friends of peace—for the purpose of fostering a movement for the “promotion of Indian independence by peaceful means only.” (Applause)

THE CHAIRMAN: Now I think it would be fair, having had two brief speeches from two different types of Indians, to see whether we can find a different type of Englishman, and so I am going to ask our old friend Mr. Ratcliffe (applause), English journalist, author of “Sir William Wedderburn and the Indian Reform,” and formerly Editor of *The Statesman* in Calcutta, to show that an Englishman can keep to five minutes as well as an Indian. Mr. Ratcliffe! (Applause)

MR. S. K. RATCLIFFE

M^{R.} McDONALD, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: This is an impossible task. It is not the first impossible task that the Chairman of the Foreign Policy Association has given to me from time to time.

In regard to India we waste a great deal of time in going back to the affairs of the past and especially its blunders and crimes. There are illustrations of that in the discussion to which we have just listened. One illustration is the opium situation. Mr. Ghose quoted the indictment by our friend, Mr. C. F. Andrews, of the official opium policy. He forgot to mention that Mr. Andrews himself has quite recently been writing in *The Manchester Guardian* in the strongest terms in praise of the new opium policy of the government of India. (Applause)

There is no use in just going back to where we went wrong. Dr.

Thompson has already acknowledged that in full. Let us look at what the government of India is trying to do in a world situation of enormous difficulty. I was present in the council at Calcutta when the first declaration was made about the ten-year policy to which Dr. Thompson has referred. Our Indian friends know perfectly well that the policy of the Indian government for eliminating the opium traffic would have reached a very large measure of success if we had been able to get the full cooperation of other European governments and if China in the interval had not gone into chaos, so that it is quite impossible to have any international control of the poppy fields of that great country.

My friend, Mr. Rezmie, said that Mr. Gandhi today would accept an offer of a discussion if dominion status were immediately granted. In my last batch of clippings from home I saw an interview between Mr. Gandhi and the special correspondent of a London newspaper, which seemed to me to carry evidence of its being a perfectly straight report. Mahatma Gandhi said in that interview that they could not go into conference except on the basis of arranging an immediate cut between India and the British system.

That, we must submit, is a quite impossible thing and I think the most serious aspect of the point is this: Unquestionably Mr. Gandhi has been manoeuvred by the hotheads of his own party into a position which represents for him a most serious dilemma. We know from the public evidence that he did not agree with that position a year ago. He has used all his great personal influence to bring moderation into the tactics associated with the recent Congress resolution; he knows perfectly well from his own experience that it is of no use to say that the British government encourages communal disputes, or will start the violence. Mr. Gandhi has made his own confession over and over again when violence has arisen, and has taken the responsibility to himself. There is no separating revolutionary activity from violence, and whenever violence occurs Mr. Gandhi pursues his own unvarying rule. He repudiates it and separates himself from it. He goes into retreat, and imposes upon himself penance in expiation of the wrongdoing.

We submit to Mr. Gandhi—who is the most extraordinary leader in the world, from whatever point of view we look upon him—this: He asks for evidence of a change of heart on the part of the British people and the British government. The only evidence a democracy can give of a change of heart is a change of political mind, to begin with. We of today are not responsible for the present situation in India. The Labor government of Great Britain is not responsible for the difficult heritage that it has to manage. Mr. MacDonald agrees with the Viceroy in the declaration of a new policy, and he offers the open round table conference as soon as we have some immediate evidence to go upon.

To Mr. Gandhi surely we are entitled to say, "You are the apostle and the leader of the principle of non-violence. There is only one alternative to a violent settlement and that is a settlement by consent. There is only one road to a settlement by consent. That means the coming into conference. You cannot refuse that if you are to be faithful to your own great principle." (Applause)

RECENT BOOKS ON INDIA

Andrews, C. F. Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas. New York, Macmillan, 1930

Archbold, W. A. J. Outlines of Indian Constitutional History. London, King, 1927

Chirol, Sir Valentine. India. New York, Scribner, 1926

Garratt, G. T. An Indian Commentary. London, Cape, 1928

Hoyland, J. S. The Case for India. New York, Dutton, 1930

Hull, W. I. India's Political Crisis. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1930

Mayo, Katherine. Mother India. New York, Harcourt, 1927

Mukerji, D. G. A Son of Mother India Answers. New York, Dutton, 1928

Smith, Vincent. The Oxford History of India. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1923

Sunderland, J. T. India in Bondage. New York, Copeland, 1930

Thompson, Edward. The Other Side of the Medal. New York, Harcourt, 1926

Williams, G. M. Understanding India. New York, Coward-McCann, 1928

Zimand, Savel. Living India. New York, Longmans, 1928

